

THE OPEN COURT.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE.

No. 311. (VOL. VII.—32.)

CHICAGO, AUGUST 10, 1893.

Two Dollars per Year.
Single Copies, 5 Cents.

COPYRIGHT BY THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING Co.—Reprints are permitted only on condition of giving full credit to Author and Publisher.

ALIENS WANTED!

THE *Washington Post* lately published an editorial under the caption "Assistant Anarchist, Perhaps," in which "Mr." Hermann Lieb is pilloried as an alien whose Fourth of July celebration consists in "applauding a blow at the institutions which were born that day." "Mr. Hermann Lieb," the editor of the *Post* says, "informs us that he is an alien. We should have guessed it from his utterances."

The *Washington Sentinel* has taken the trouble to give the nativistic editor of the *Post* a lesson in the history of our country. And the editor of the *Post* needs it, for he seems to know little either about American institutions and their spirit or about the history of the United States. The *Washington Sentinel* says:

"That article is evidently from the pen of the Republican head of the *Post*, Mr. Hatton, formerly of Iowa. He and several other editors of the same calibre have for some time sounded the tocsin of war against the 'aliens,' i. e. foreign born citizens.

"As we happen to know that 'alien,' Mr. Hermann Lieb, for many years, we will place Mr. Hatton under involuntary obligation to us, by telling him, what he evidently does not know, who that Assistant Anarchist, that 'alien,' Mr. Lieb, is.

"When Mr. Hatton was a very little boy and was playing marbles on the dusty streets of Burlington, in fact long before any trace of his journalistic fame was perceptible, that 'alien' Mr. Lieb was fighting the battles of this country, commanding an Illinois volunteer regiment in some of the bloodiest battles of the late war. When the war ended this 'alien' was honorably discharged as Brigadier General. Of course Mr. Hatton knows nothing of that, as he was too young at the time when that occurred.

"General Lieb, the 'Assistant Anarchist, Perhaps,' is an old German-American Democrat. He is one of the best Democratic speakers in the West. But Mr. Hatton is a Republican, and that explains his want of personal knowledge of General Lieb's status.

"If the publishers of the *Post* and the other city Know-Nothing papers will take our advice, they will at once provide means and ways to instruct their editors in the history of the country during the past forty years, and drive their Know-Nothing nonsense and native self-conceit out of their silly little heads. We will give them lessons *gratis*, if they only allow us the use of their columns. At any rate their 'alien' advertisers will thank them for it if they evince a better understanding of their country's history and best interest."

To classify Governor Altgeld, the Generals Hermann Lieb and M. M. Trumbull, or any other men of their stamp as Anarchists is not only ridiculous but also dishonest. What the Chicago Anarchists were

guilty of was the holding of incendiary meetings and the publishing of revolutionary articles; but they were indicted and convicted for a crime which was never proved against them. If they had been indicted and convicted, according to the law, for their illegal speeches, they would have suffered justly. But in fact they were indicted for the murder of Matthias Degan by the explosion of a bomb, a result which the prosecution pretended was brought about by the inflammatory speeches of the defendants. And the prosecution rested mainly on the assumption that they were Anarchists who had been preaching revolutionary views. Failing to connect the defendants with the bomb-throwing the prosecution pretended that their speeches and writings were in some remote way the cause of the bomb-throwing. The jury was easily persuaded to take this view of it and the defendants were convicted. Governor Altgeld has convincingly shown that this conviction was itself revolutionary, anarchistic, and illegal.

We do not defend the Anarchists, nor would we justify the licence of preaching assassination and revolution. But let us not forget that the licence which they took was generally practiced by the same journals and newspapers which are now loudest in their denunciation of Governor Altgeld. These were guilty of the very same offence as the Anarchists. They recommended the use of shells and all kinds of weapons against the strikers.* As if violence was a matter of principle, they found no fault with the dynamiters in Ireland, and instead of rebuking their methods of reform, encouraged and unhesitatingly justified them. They themselves panegyricised assassination abroad and preached its practice at home against their socialistic adversaries, but in others they regarded the mere thought of violence as punishable by death.

The question before the jury was not whether Anarchism was to be condemned or tolerated, but whether or not the defendants were guilty of the crime committed at the Haymarket. If their guilt could not be proved by evidence beyond a reasonable doubt, they should have been acquitted—whatever were their opin-

* We quote from the *Chicago Times*: "Hand-grenades should be thrown among these union sailors who are striving to obtain higher wages."

ions on social questions, on politics, religion, or anything else.

We must say in excuse of the prosecution and the jury that the time in which the verdict was given was one of extraordinary excitement. The people did not know what the Anarchist movement might result in ; it might have developed into a real revolution as it did about a century ago in France. In a word, the people were afraid. They were overpowered by a feeling of unsafety. There was a lack of confidence in the stability of our institutions. And cowardice is always the cause of cruelty and tyranny. A strong government only can afford to dispense justice ; a weak government naturally resorts to oppression. The panic that prevailed at the time of the trial is the only excuse for the judge, the prosecution, and the jurors. Allowance must be made for the frailty of human nature, and we should therefore not be too severe on men who tried to do their duty and failed.

The conviction of the Anarchists was an act of lawlessness, it was a violation of the most sacred rights of the citizens of all civilised countries. We complain of the Czar that his judges condemn persons, not for crimes, but for opinions ; yet we ourselves, in this respect, were not better than the Czar.

What person's life, liberty, and property would not be jeopardised, if our courts ceased to judge strictly according to the law, and if in times of excitement people could be hanged because they hold opinions averse to the prevailing sentiment ?

Courts that dispense justice without interfering with the personal rights of the people are the cornerstone of all civilisation and especially so in a republic.

The conviction of the Anarchists would have been an impossibility in England, in France, and also in Germany, for in all these countries the judges are independent even of the government. But our judges and juries, to a great extent, are not independent ; they represent the average opinion of our public and are influenced by public prejudices and fears.

Governor Altgeld stated his reasons for granting a pardon to the Anarchists. He has been savagely abused for this, but no one has as yet refuted his arguments.

Considering all in all we ask, Who is the conservator of law and of justice, and who is the Anarchist or law breaker ? Who is truly American and who is alien to the spirit of our institutions ? Altgeld or his opponents ? The United States of America would be more American if we had among us more aliens of the stamp of Altgeld, Trumbull, and Hermann Lieb ! If these men are typical aliens, let us have them. Such aliens are wanted !

Governor Altgeld knows as well as his opponents that the Anarchists held opinions which are unsound and even dangerous. But that is no reason for with-

holding justice from them. Governor Altgeld had the courage to right a wrong. He has, for his brave action, been reviled by those who know not what they are doing, but he will be blessed for it by later generations ; and the document in which he has set forth the arguments that induced him to grant the pardon, will forever remain a valuable inheritance and a memento to strengthen the sense of justice in our children and our children's children.

EDITOR.

THE ETHICS OF LEGAL TENDER.

BY M. M. TRUMBULL.

THE bronze policeman in the Haymarket seems to have no more terrors for anarchistic orators than the statue of Columbus on the Lake Front. Within easy pistol-shot of the county jail, the Silverite party held a convention on the 1st of August, where silver-tongued agitators of high rank inflamed the passions of the delegates by denunciations, exhortations, and appeals, which, had they been uttered by workingmen, might have put them in peril of their lives.

Amid thunders of applause, Gen. A. J. Warner, a statesman of great influence, and formerly a member of Congress, paid his compliments to Senator Sherman in language plagiarised from the Lake Front speeches delivered by the so called Chicago Anarchists in 1886. After mildly referring to the Senator as a "demon" and a "whited sepulcher," he delicately hinted that through some neglect or oversight the Senator had not yet been hanged or sent to the penitentiary. ("He ought to be," shouted a red-faced, silver-bearded delegate, who was standing in the aisle.) General Warner said that the "plot to demonetise silver would be known in history as the crime of 1893. Let those who had to do with it rot in oblivion." ("That's what they deserve," said the man in the aisle.)

Continuing according to the Lake Front model, General Warner said : "You did not wade through slaughter to liberate a black race, to allow our own children to become slaves." Referring to the capitalistic enemies of a free silver coinage, the orator said : "Men who try to destroy the conditions of peaceful society are the real Anarchists. This is a life and death struggle." ("That's what it is," said the man in the aisle.) This exciting and rather inflammatory talk made the convention delirious with enthusiasm. General Weaver rushed up to congratulate the speaker, while the delegates stood upon chairs, waved their hats, and howled. The bronze policeman held up his hand and threatened, all in vain.

The proceedings had at the Silverite convention reveal the intense feeling on the money question that now prevails, especially among those who think that their own particular interests are placed in jeopardy by the anticipated legislation of Congress.

I have received some letters from critics of my views on the money question, but as they all assume a legal tender prerogative as a necessary element of money, we have no ethical or economic basis of agreement or of difference. Government may usurp the power to give money a legal tender quality, but in the dominion of morals the act is absolutely void. There justice reigns. Every debt contains a moral obligation, which it is not in the power of any government to discharge. For several years I have maintained with very poor success that before our monetary system can stand firm on a scientific foundation, it must be released from the pernicious patronage of government and the legal tender quality taken from every form of money. I have just received a letter from a correspondent in Ohio, a fervent bimetallist, in which he says: "I have given your suggestion to strip money of its legal tender function considerable thought, and must confess there is a deal in the proposition to recommend it. But the great powers giving one metal the legal tender fiction, would give to that one metal here a corresponding advantage over the other as a commodity."

My correspondent seems to think that at least one form of money must have the legal tender quality, and this opinion appears to be almost universal. This gives me no uneasiness whatever, for I can wait. I see a few signs which indicate that I shall not have to wait so long as I expected, for within the past two weeks, the *Chicago Herald* has abandoned the whole theory of legal tender as mischievous and unsound. Mr. Edward Atkinson, in his latest book, "Taxation and Work," surrenders the legal tender principle in a rather qualified form. He says: "There is no need of a legal tender among men who intend to meet their contracts honestly." The qualification does not qualify, because, if honest men do not need any legal tender, dishonest men ought not to have its aid, and Mr. Atkinson might as well have said: "There is no need of legal tender at all."

Commenting on Mr. Atkinson's views of legal tender, the *Westminster Review* remarks as follows: "That expression 'legal tender,' by the way, is not a well-defined one in Dr. Atkinson's mind. He imports into the well-established phrase the idea that a nation is always on the watch to palm off a coin for more than it is really worth—whereas the value of legal tender is to meet the convenience of the community by earmarking the best medium of exchange; and the history of currency shows us over and over again that, if the government sets its seal upon an inadequate medium, the nation will set it aside."

The above explanation shows that the phrase "legal tender" is much better defined in Mr. Atkinson's mind than it is in the mind of his critic. The *Westminster Review* seems to think that the phrase "legal

tender" does not now include any debt-paying qualities, but is merely an indirect method of "earmarking the best medium of exchange." This may be all the effect it has in England, since the government has adopted the standard of the markets, but in the United States it means the privilege of paying debts with depreciated coin or currency. Even the limited and comparatively harmless character of "legal tender," as defined by the *Westminster Review*, condemns it, because the *Review* confesses that government sometimes earmarks an "inadequate medium," instead of the "best medium," which is a very good reason why it should altogether cease the practice of earmarking money. By the nation the *Review* means, of course, not the government, but the people in their markets. And here, every inadequate medium will be set aside, because the government has no power to make anything a legal tender in the purchase of goods. Where, however, the inadequate medium has the government authority to discharge debts, it may work incalculable mischief before the nation can "set it aside."

Much confusion, not only of mental ideas, but of moral ideas also, has arisen from an innocent use of words and phrases, such, for instance, as "payment," "legal tender," "full legal tender," and the like. Some people mean by "full legal tender" the power to buy goods as well as to pay debts. This was the meaning given to the phrase by the French republic, and the penalty for giving it a more limited meaning was death. Yet the legal tender of the French republic could not buy goods, although it had behind it the French nation, the forfeited lands of the nobility and clergy, and the guillotine. Even England, at a later day, decreed by law that no person should give more for a guinea than twenty-one shillings in paper money, and all persons were forbidden to give less for a one pound note than twenty shillings in silver. This was statesmanship in England as late as the nineteenth century. But it was void statesmanship. Men gave the market value for the paper money, and no more. There was not power enough in the British monarchy to compel them to give more, and the reason of it is that omnipotence is denied to man. Creation is the sole prerogative of the Almighty. Neither Parliament nor Congress can create value. They may take value from one thing and add it to another, as in legal tender legislation, but they cannot create value to the amount of fifty cents.

In demanding the free coinage of silver into money, the Silver Convention meant "legal tender" money, and any proposition to grant free coinage to silver at its actual value would have been repudiated with scorn. If we take from coins the fictitious value given to them by "legal tender" laws, there can be no objection to coining all the Rocky mountains into silver dollars, so

long as they can be absorbed without artificial pressure into the business of the country. When the country needs no further supply of those dollars the coinage of them will automatically cease.

As all the proceedings of the convention were inspired by the "legal tender" theory, this will account in some degree for the inconsistencies of the speakers, for the extravagance of the speeches and the amusing fables incorporated into the preambles and the resolutions. Like the effigy at the fair, which anyone may throw a stick at for a penny, an imaginary figure called "old England" was displayed upon the platform and every speaker took a shy at that for nothing. Senator Allen of Nebraska made the following astonishing statement: "The people have confidence in the government, but at present we cannot breathe except through the lungs of old England." ("Hit 'em again, they're English," yelled delegate Hanna.) Congressman Newlands said that "England's subtle policy was behind the present troubled condition in the money world." And the chairman, in introducing Governor Waite to the audience, said: "There is one man in the United States who has been accused of everything bloody, except that of being a bloody Englishman." Whenever the knives and daggers of rhetoric became dull they were immediately sharpened by the speakers on the effigy of "old England," and then used upon Cleveland, Sherman, or Carlisle.

In a purely emotional and sentimental convention it is unreasonable to expect much logical coherence in the speeches, or harmony of statement. Therefore it is not surprising to find Governor Waite holding up as a warning "the disastrous result in England of the gold policy," while General Warner declared that the result of her gold policy had enriched England and made her the great creditor nation of the world. \$5,000,000,000, he said, was now due to England from other nations.

By this time it began to glimmer upon some of the delegates that the "disastrous policy" which had enriched England, might enrich the United States, but the light was immediately extinguished by Mr. Thomas, of Colorado, who showed that the mathematics of business worked one result in England, and a contradictory result in America. He described the "ruin attendant upon following the dictates of England" and said, quoting John Sherman as authority, "It is a known fact that the reverse of what suits England always suits this country." This profound maxim drawn from the ethics of anglophobia is very popular in America, although I have never heard it except in the election season, and then I have known it to do good service. If England uses one multiplication table, it is our duty to reject it and use a table that gives different results. If England uses one language we should use another,

and if England will persistently remain a Christian country, we ought to embrace the religion of Mahomet. If what Mr. Thomas and the rest of them said is true, all other nations are merely the commercial satellites of England, and even the United States of America is under the hypnotic spell of that country, and powerless to resist her will.

THE STORY OF AN OLD LONDON SOCIETY.

BY MONCURE D. CONWAY.

II.

WILLIAM VIDLER, stonemason at Battle, brought up a churchman, was persuaded by his sweetheart, Miss Sweetingham, to listen to a Baptist preacher in her father's house. Either through influence of the preacher or the sweetheart young Vidler became a Baptist, and was consoled for parental alienation by marriage with his sweetheart. He became the Baptist preacher in Battle, and in 1787, aged 27, was trying to support a wife and five children on fifty pounds a year, which he besought the Lord to increase. In 1792, when the author of "The Rights of Man" was burnt in effigy at Battle, as elsewhere, the mob stopped at the doors of eminent dissenters, crying "No Paine!" Vidler came out and complimented them on the ingenuity of their effigy; and to their demand, whether he was for Paine, replied, "No, my lads, be sure I have no liking for *pain*; I am for *ease*." The mob laughed, gave him three cheers, and passed on. About the same time Elhanan Winchester visited Battle; Vidler heard and surrendered. The congregation was also converted, and with their Minister were formally excommunicated at Chatham; the Baptist Presiding Elder expressing to Vidler, who was present, a wish "that the hell he advocated might be his portion." After Winchester's departure for America, Vidler succeeded him at Parliament Court, London. He edited a monthly—"The Universalist Miscellany, or Philanthropist's Museum. Intended chiefly as an Antidote against the Anti-Christian doctrine of Endless Misery." In one of the volumes there is a portrait of his thoughtful countenance. He dreaded the Unitarians, but was steadily convinced of their tenets. In 1802 he abandoned the Trinitarian dogma, and was a martyr: large numbers of the Society left him. Denial of the Trinity cost the Society three hundred and twenty pounds per annum. Vidler's salary was reduced to thirty pounds. But Vidler thrived on martyrdom; from being thin and consumptive he became gigantic, and once, when driving with Rev. Robert Ashland, their carriage suffering a collision, Vidler's weight kept it from upsetting. His mental and moral weight kept Parliament Court Chapel from upsetting when it collided with Trinitarianism. They went on bravely and gradually recovered strength. Curiously enough, the Baptist

notion of a "chosen people" survived the Universalist and Unitarian conversions, holding its traditional exclusiveness at the Communion Table until 1808, when all were invited to partake. Having then got the Philadelphian substance, they gave up the name. Among the advanced ideas of Mr. Vidler was his protest against cruelty to animals; so early as 1801:

"There are several species of barbarity in this *Christian* country which reflect dishonor on our national character. Throwing at cocks, we believe, is pretty generally disused since our moral Mentor, Addison, so compassionately pleaded their cause in one of the papers of the Spectator; but cock-fighting and bull-baiting yet continue; and we fear that the practice of pinning the cockchafer among children is yet frequent. Parents and tutors of youth ought to discourage everything of the kind; from cruelty to animals the transition is very natural to cruelty to our own species."

He proceeds to place under ban even the pleasures of the chase, a radicalism on which none had previously ventured. Vidler was soft-hearted; he once pawned his watch to help a poor man named Javel, who sometimes came to his Chapel. But Javel was really a footpad, and one night tried to rob Vidler. (Later on the footpad was executed at Chelmsford.) Vidler died in 1816, and lies in the Unitarian graveyard at Hackney. He was a very eloquent extemporaneous preacher, had taught himself Hebrew and the classical languages, and was an ingenious critic. He was the first to speak a good word for Judas, whom De Quincey and others have since vindicated, and who is now proved a mythical type of ancient anti-Semitic hatred. Judas, he thought, meant to bring on a crisis between Jesus and the priesthood, and never doubted that the latter would be overthrown. He also pointed out that the account does not say that he hanged himself, but that he was choked with grief. This was a bold thing to write in 1799, the period following Paine's "Age of Reason," when freethinkers were in prison, and Unitarians forswearing freedom with the protestations of St. Peter. He also preached three sermons on Satan, which the congregation wished him to print; but death prevented, and it cannot now be known whether he made out a good case for the Devil also.

Darkness shrouded the little Chapel when Vidler died; but in that darkness rose its star, to lead the Society for a generation with ever increasing light. This was the Rev. William Johnson Fox, M.P., the most eloquent pulpit orator known to English annals. The biography of Fox, on which his daughter, Mrs. Bridell Fox, is engaged, will make many for the first time acquainted with him; for he was one of those men whose concentration on their own time transmits to the future results of their work rather than their name. Fox was to London even more than Theodore Parker was to Boston. He too was a mechanic in boyhood, and in the Corn Law agitation signed his letters "The

Norwich Weaver Boy." Born at Wrentham, Suffolk, 1786, his father moved to Norwich, where the lad had four years schooling in a dissenting Chapel school. His father, Paul Fox, was a rigid Calvinist, and from him the son had a hard pious training. But his mother had some imagination; and, there being few books in the house besides Bibles, she used to get novels from some library and read them to her son while he was at the loom. An old friend of mine remembers his saying, in the pulpit, "I was brought up on the sour milk of Calvinism, and surely it disagreed with me." How much does liberalism owe to John Calvin! He burnt one Unitarian, but has made millions. Yet Calvinism did not in those days lose its grip on youth because of its repulsiveness. It held young Fox with its glittering eye, and offered the only door to a career of moral influence. In his twentieth year he entered Homerton College, London, to study for the ministry under the eminent Dr. Pye Smith. Each student was required on entrance to make a statement of his belief, and it may interest your readers to peruse that of this youth (1806) who subsequently became the leading Theist of England:

"The Christian religion is a display of the perfections of God, as they are exemplified in His conduct towards the human race. It teaches us that so depraved are we by nature, and so vicious by habit, that it was impossible for God to offer pardon to such guilty creatures, unless reparation was made to his offended justice. Jesus Christ, the only begotten of the Father, who dwelt in his bosom from eternity, has in human flesh suffered the punishment due to our iniquities, and God has promised that whosoever believeth in Him shall in nowise perish, but have everlasting life. Yet such is the infatuation which Sin and Satan have produced in the human heart, that all would neglect this great salvation, did not the Holy Spirit incline the heart of some to receive it, while the rest are left to experience the dreadful consequences of their obstinacy.

"Impressed with a deep sense of that Almighty Goodness which has snatched me as a brand from the burning, and animated with an ardent desire to be an instrument in the hands of God of awakening some to the knowledge of their state, and the necessity of a crucified Saviour, it is my earnest wish to engage in the work of the ministry; relying not on my own strength, but on the grace of God, for support through the difficulties of that awfully responsible station, and fully resolved to devote, through the remainder of my existence, the talents with which I am entrusted to the glory of God and the best interests of my fellow-creatures."

So low on the ladder, yet with such upward look, did Fox set his feet in his twentieth year. He was shy; in his first sermon, to aged spinsters of a neighboring almshouse, he could hardly utter anything. But in 1810 he left Homerton with high testimonials, and settled with an Independent chapel at Fareham. But hardly had he begun to preach before he was beset by doubts. A Catholic priest has sent me a letter written by Mr. Fox to his grandfather in that year, in which he says:

"My young friends say, throw off the trammels of Orthodoxy, dissolve an unpromising connection now. My old friends will

think me worse than mad to give up Fareham. My own plan at present is this—to fulfil my twelve months' engagement—to advance my sentiments boldly, explicitly, firmly, and at the end of the time to remain with them, should they wish it, only on certain conditions, such as throwing open the doors of fellowship to heretics. If they submit to this, I cannot expect to find a more desirable situation. If they will not, I shall leave them with more credit than now, immediately after coming amongst them. We have many heretics here,—Universalists, etc.,—who vie with the others in zealous attachment to myself. This gives me fine opportunity for uniting and forming them. But, alas, the heretics understand one's discourses and use their powers, while the orthodox are such fools, that one may preach all the heresies in Christendom without their knowing it, unless they are told so. Should Bishop Bogue, or any one else, tell them so, then down go my castles in the air."

(Here is a curious incident. At Fareham this young minister was much interested in teaching a deaf and dumb girl, Mary Franklin. Eight years after he had left Fareham, he married a lady of Chichester, and their first child (a boy) was born deaf and dumb.)

Through painful doubts the minister was borne as by a torrent, his heart still moored to the old associations.

"I had at times, actually, fearfully, and vividly, the prospect of being damned for not believing what I could not believe. It was amid deprecations and agitations that I pursued my inquiries. I had no sympathisers, no confidant; external expressions of what was going on did but occasion coldness, suspicion, alienation; my path was through dark valleys, shaken by an earthquake. It seemed as if there were a spell on me, and I must go on, feeling that I was going wrong, toiling to arrive at the abandonment of Heaven, and diligently marking out my own damnation. The investigation became more and more fascinating. I used to take books on the Unitarian controversy to bed with me and read them for hours with the candle on my pillow."

Mr. Fox endeavored to form a Society at Fareham on a "comprehensive principle, with Virtue and not Faith for the bond of union,"—thus anticipating the Ethical Culturists by over eighty years,—but the speculative heretics had no inclination for any such ventures. He parted with the Trinitarian dogma in 1810, with that of the Atonement in 1811, but with the eternity of hell only in 1812. The free-born Liberal might expect that this monstrous absurdity of hell would be the first abandoned; but it must be remembered that it was by that chronic panic about damnation that the whole system of absurdities was built up. No orthodox dogma could have been tolerated had not reason been terrorised. Hell was the *raison d'être* of church and priesthood; so by evolutionary law it is the most deeply imbred and the last to go. It is this that makes the spiritual progress of so many minds a series of convulsions, instead of a happy expansion under the light of their time. When Fox had prevailed against that phantasm, the storm was over; the peaceful azure spread above. Soon after, in 1812, he was ministering to a congenial Unitarian Society in Chichester. There he had leisure for culture and had

there won a wide reputation for eloquence, when he was invited to settle with the Parliament Court Chapel,—where his first discourse was given on Easter Sunday, 1817.

WHY WE CALL GOD "HE."

BY MERWIN-MARIE SNELL.

OBJECTIONS are often raised by advanced thinkers of several types to the application of the personal, and especially of the masculine, pronoun to Deity.

Some object, because it is not a person; others, because it is without sex; others, because there is in the fulness of its being the attributes of every sex; and others, again, because its prolific fecundity and universally fostering care may be more fitly represented in thought as a Maternity than as a Fatherhood.

Those who realise how essential to the integrity of individual thought is the principle of the essential veracity of universal human nature will be prepared to find for a usage so general, as that which is thus questioned, some rational sanction in the nature of language and of that Being or Aspect of Being for which a suitable pronominal designation is the desideratum.

I shall endeavor in the following paragraphs to show that (1) although God is superpersonal, and therefore (2) sexless, and (3) yet in a certain sense bisexual, and although (4) his creative and preservative activities constitute a true Maternity, nevertheless (5), when considered from the religious point of view, it is the pronoun He which alone can justly be applied to Him.

It would not be germane to my subject to enter upon a discussion of the nature of Deity. Let it suffice to remark that if God is not a person in the ordinary sense of the word, He must be either more or less than one; but the very nature of the God-idea is that of a Highest, therefore He is superpersonal and not infrapersonal; and as there is no superpersonal pronoun, the personal one is the nearest approach to exact expression which is possible in the present state of language.

All who accept the God-idea agree in recognising in cosmic thought and cosmic order, in the sum-total of universal ideas, the highest manifestation of Godhood, if not its very essence. Now, the words *he* and *she* are applied to beings just so far and so far only as they share, or are supposed to share, or are for the occasion represented as sharing, in this cosmic thought, in this heritage of the ideal.

For example, in the animal world we, as a rule, say he and she only of those species or individuals which are the most intelligent. Even in speaking of the same animal we are apt to use the word *it*, when speaking of it as a mere object, a thing, but *he* or *she* when viewing it as a being capable of entering into relations

of thought and sympathy with ourselves. Grounding ourselves upon this principle, we cannot fail to recognise that nowhere is the personal pronoun more appropriate than in references to the grand Sum-Total of universal thought, that vast and all-penetrating Law which is the necessary condition and responsive object of all our thinking.

But why do we speak of this Superpersonality as if it were masculine? Is it not raised far above the differences of sex? Yes, it is true that whether we view it with the scholastic as *Actus Purissima*, i. e., Most Simple Energy, or, with our nearest contemporaries, as the Ideal World-All, it is in every case necessary to consider it as devoid of extension and material shape, and therefore of sex, in the ordinary and literal sense of that term.

But in the God of the scholastics all things exist "eminently," as the expression went, (*eminenter*), and the God of the religion of science is in like manner the summation of all excellencies, since he is the enduring element of existence, the Subjectivity of the universe; and in either case he unites in himself all that is admirable and divine, he is both father and mother, husband and wife, brother and sister; and the very Archetype of fatherhood, motherhood, brotherhood, and sisterhood.

If all this be so, then the question forces itself anew upon us, with still greater imperativeness, Why is it that we forget the motherhood, and wifeness, and sisterhood, and speak of God only as the Father, the Husband, the Brother?

In this, as in many other instances, there are two standpoints which may be taken by the devotee of the religion of science; that of pure science and that of the particular application of science which is called religion.

Whatever is thought of may be considered either in its objective or in its ideal affinities; either in its relation to things or to thoughts; either from the standpoint of the body or of the soul. The world-all, considered in its relation to material, objective existence, is Mother Nature, the creatrix, the preservatrix, the transmutress. This is the Sakta of Hindu thought, Mâhadevi, "the Great Goddess," (identical again with the Ionic Demeter,) she, who to the Vedantists becomes Mâhamâya, "the Great Illusion."

It is because this conception is a philosophical, rather than a religious, one, that many of the sects of India have given it such exceptional prominence. The Hindus are very prone to allow their philosophies, profoundly subtle and of lasting value as they often are, to usurp the garb and office of religion, to which they have little claim.

Religion views God in his relation, not to material things, but to the soul. God stands, as it were, upon

one side, and the soul upon the other. The happiness, the very life of the soul, depends upon its union with him. In this union, which is the very essence of religion, it is God who takes the initiative. God acts, and the soul coöperates. God is the Supporter, the Lover, the Bridegroom, of the soul. The study of the psychology of the spiritual life makes it more and more evident that the mystics of all ages, from the bard, who in the name of Solomon wrote the Song of Songs, down to the author of the Gita Govinda, have been right in representing it under the image of an espousal, in which the divinity is the bridegroom and the soul the bride. The attribution to the Supreme Object of religious devotion of fatherhood and brotherhood involves a similar conception. The World-All speaks continually to every soul through a thousand voices, summoning it to a loving participation in the Cosmic Life, a loving submission to Cosmic Law, a loving repose in Cosmic Order; the elect soul hears the call, obeys its Heavenly Father, embraces its Celestial Bridegroom, follows the leadership of its Elder Brother.

The truly religious attitude of the spirit is a distinctly feminine one; masculinity may be the vehicle of theology or philosophy, but it cannot attain to the Divine union. It is the gentleness, affectionateness, trustfulness, dependence, loyalty, appreciativeness, and seership of womanhood, which are the essential conditions of the Supreme Beatitude. Children reflect these qualities so perfectly that Jesus said: "Unless ye become as a little child ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."

It is because God, on the other hand, is a synonym for the highest degree of sustaining power, protecting guardianship, sage direction, illuminating thought, and potent attraction that we call him Father, and that some have called him Lover, and Bridegroom, and Husband.

HEAVENLY FATHER AND MOTHER.

BY ELIZABETH CADY STANTON.

IN *The Open Court* of July 6th a correspondent asks for the proper pronoun to designate the great first cause,—the Creator of all things and objects to the pronouns "he," "his," and "him," and "she," "hers," and "her." As the masculine and feminine elements must have been simultaneous in all creation, in thought as well as matter, united in the Godhead, there should be some comprehensive pronoun recognising the united sex. But since linguists have not yet supplied the need, we must introduce the "Heavenly Mother" in our prayers, and hymns of praise, and in asking a blessing at our tables.

Theodore Parker always began his prayers "Heavenly Father and Mother." I well remember what a

new world of thought it opened to me the first time I heard it. An Episcopal clergyman, told me that when Emerson was visiting him, he tried to find out whether he believed in God, without asking him directly. He thought he could do so by inviting him to say grace at table. But Emerson simply looked up and said, "Spirit of all good make us thankful." Thus avoiding all questionable pronouns and leaving his host still in doubt as to the nice shades of his belief in God, and his supervision of our daily bread.

The usual masculine grace has long been a thorn in my flesh. It is enough to make all the feminine angels weep to see a healthy, happy, bumptious man with a good appetite, spread his hands out over a nicely roasted turkey that his feeble little wife has basted and turned for two hours in a hot oven, and thank the Lord as if the whole meal had come down like manna from heaven, whereas like magic, one little pair of hands had produced the whole menu. There she sits at the head of the table from day to day, with bowed head, while the Lord gets all the glory of her labors. My sympathy with these patient souls, culminated one day in the composition of a more fitting grace, for our sires and sons to use in future, especially when their own wives and mothers are the culinary artists. Though an occasional word of praise for faithful Bridget might sweeten her daily toil.

"Heavenly Father and Mother, make us thankful for all the blessings of this life; and make us ever mindful of the patient hands, that oft in weariness spread our tables, and prepare our daily food, for humanity's sake, Amen."

However, the pronouns "he," "his," and "him" are used in law for both sexes. In the whole criminal code there is no mention of "she," "hers," and "her." Women are tried and hung as "he." Whether the codifiers of our laws thought us too good ever to be found in such disreputable classes, or of too little consequence as factors in civilisation for notice, is an open question. But singularly enough, as there is no mention of "she," "hers," and "her" in the constitutions, we are not allowed to vote or enjoy the privileges of male citizens, but the criminal code being more *liberally interpreted* we can be punished as male citizens. "Consistency is indeed a jewel."

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE GERM-PLASM. A Theory of Heredity. By *August Weismann*. Translated by *W. Newton Parker, Ph. D.*, and *Harriet Rönnefeldt*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1893. (Pp. 477.)

The readers of *The Open Court* will find a complete discussion of the chief thesis of this work from the pen of the distinguished English biologist, Prof. C. Lloyd Morgan, in the next number of *The Monist*; so that anything more than mention of the work is here unnecessary. It will be sufficient to say that Dr. Weismann

has collected here the results of many years of labor on the question of Heredity—results which have made him famous and have considerably modified the course of study of this problem. The translation, which has been a difficult one, is apparently well made, though with the word *Anlage* the translator confesses he has had much difficulty. The *Anlage* of an animal is its constitutional characters and capacities, as distinguished from its acquired ones, and might be so translated where disposition will not do. Professor Parker uses the phrases "primary constituents," "rudiment," etc.

We may also mention that The Open Court Publishing Company will very soon publish the second volume of Prof. G. J. Romanes's "Darwin and After Darwin." This second volume, entitled "Post-Darwinian Questions," is mainly devoted to Weismannism, and those who are following Romanes's discussion would do well to read Professor Weismann's book. μκрк.

Charles H. Kerr & Co. have just published a collection of Sermons (edited by Mr. James Vila Blake) of the late Henry Doty Maxson, pastor of the Unitarian Society of Menomonie, Wisconsin. The sermons are well written and will doubtless find many readers. Mr. Henry Martyn Simmons has supplied a biographical introduction. The paper and letterpress of the book are not as good as they usually are in the books of this company. (Pp., 334; price, \$1.00.)

INSTRUCTION given by correspondence to students of Plato, Aristotle, and other philosophers. Write for Circular. Editor *Bibliotheca Platonica*, Osceola, Mo.

THE OPEN COURT.

"THE MONON," 324 DEARBORN STREET.

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, Post Office Drawer F.

E. C. HEGELER, PUBLISHER.

DR. PAUL CARUS, EDITOR.

TERMS THROUGHOUT THE POSTAL UNION:

\$2.00 PER YEAR.

\$1.00 FOR SIX MONTHS.

N. B. Binding Cases for single yearly volumes of THE OPEN COURT will be supplied on order. Price, 75 cents each.

CONTENTS OF NO. 311.

ALIENS WANTED. EDITOR.....	3759
THE ETHICS OF LEGAL TENDER. GEN. M. M.	
TRUMBULL.....	3760
STORY OF AN OLD LONDON SOCIETY. MONCURE	
D. CONWAY.....	3762
WHY WE CALL GOD "HE." MERWIN MARIE SNELL.	3764
HEAVENLY FATHER AND MOTHER. ELIZABETH	
CADY STANTON.....	3765
BOOK REVIEWS.....	3766